

Appl. No. 10/725,526

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
APR 18 2008

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The applicant notes the comments in the "Response to Arguments" section of the Detailed Action.

In the Action, claims 1-2, 9, 15, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Johnston (US Patent No. 5,952,733). This rejection is respectfully traversed, for at least the following reasons.

As the applicant has repeatedly stated during the prosecution of this application, the independent claims of this application recite that a regulated current or a regulated power (i.e. product of voltage and current) is supplied to the power distribution network. More particularly:

Claim 1 recites "each of the power sources is responsive to the sensed power supply voltage for supplying a regulated current or a regulated power to the power distribution network" (underlining added);

Claim 9 recites "regulating currents supplied by the plurality of power sources to the power distribution network in dependence upon the sensed voltage" (underlining added);

and

Claim 15 recites "at least one power supply voltage sensor for sensing a power supply voltage at a respective point in the power distribution network for regulating the power supplied to the power distribution network from the plurality of power sources" (underlining added).

This is not disclosed or suggested by Johnston. On the contrary, Johnston clearly recites that his power supplies regulate voltage; see for example the abstract; col. 1, line 14; col. 2, line 50; col. 3, line 6; col. 6, line 34; and claim 1 at col. 8, line 32. Johnston describes a current limiting circuit at col. 5, lines 5-22, again making it clear that the supplied current is not regulated, and hence also that the supplied power (product of voltage and current) is not regulated.

Appl. No. 10/725,526

The Detailed Action contends that Johnston teaches that "each of the power sources is responsive (col. 2 lines 64 - col. 3 line 6) to the sensed power supply voltage for supplying a regulated power (col. 1 line 15 or col. 2 lines 45-50) to the power distribution network". This contention is incorrect. Johnston clearly states and teaches that his power sources regulate voltage. They do not regulate current, as discussed above. They do not regulate power; a product of a regulated voltage and an unregulated current is clearly a power that is not regulated.

This fundamental difference between the present invention as claimed and the applied prior art is again stressed to the Examiner.

The present invention as claimed in each of the independent claims is thus clearly and patentably distinguished from Johnston.

The same applies to each of the dependent claims 2-7, 10-11, 13-14, 16 and 19 of this application for at least the same reasons, in view of their dependency from claims 1, 9 and 15. Accordingly, it is believed unnecessary here to address in detail the rejections of these claims over Johnston alone or in combination with Murabayashi et al. US Patent No. 6,121,693 or Hayward et al. US patent No. 6,317,345. These further references do not make up for the deficiencies of Johnston as discussed above in relation to the independent claims 1, 9 and 15 of this application.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the claims of this application are properly allowable. The Applicants therefore respectfully request that a Notice of Allowance be issued in this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

RAYMOND K. ORR, ET AL

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Elliott S. Simcoe  
Reg. No. 50,010

Date: January 22, 2008

RJH/wfs